



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Three years of equally cruel war against the Filipinos have manifested the unholy ambition of America to extend her rule through the blood and desolation and final annihilation of the liberties of a simple race to whom we came in the guise of liberators and friends.

The cruelties which the Anglo-Saxon race have thus continued to inflict upon men bravely struggling for the independence which the noble monument on Bunker Hill and the new monument just dedicated on Dorchester Heights prove were dear to our own race,—these ghastly cruelties have outraged the conscience and the sense of justice—I wish I might finish my sentence and say—of every right-minded American. Thank God that in the blackness of darkness which has prevailed for these last many months, signs are beginning to appear of a breaking-up and of a letting in the light of peace. Thank God that there are signs pretty evident across our land that America is coming to think that she has been engaged in a sorry business and is ashamed of her record, and is unwilling to have published to the world official reports of our own honorable officers who speak the whole truth too plainly out.

But this meeting is held to rejoice over some of the convincing proofs that the world is making progress in the direction which lovers of peace ardently desire. In spite of these two wars in South Africa and the Philippine Islands, both of which seem doubly wicked because we know that they were both needless, the progress of the world in the last fifteen years toward the final abolition of war has been more gratifying than ever before in the march of history.

Charles Sumner delivered his great oration on the "True Grandeur of Nations" nearly sixty years ago. Shortly thereafter came a period of wars—the Crimean, Italian, Austrian, our own Civil War, the Franco-Prussian and the Russo-Turkish. But since then there has come a new and different epoch. Its beginning was marked perhaps by the year 1887, when two hundred and thirty-three members of the British Parliament urged upon the President and Congress of the United States the conclusion of a treaty between these two great Anglo-Saxon nations in favor of arbitration.

The history of the events marking the progress of the movement in favor of arbitration since that year is familiar. Treaties of arbitration have been proposed and almost perfected. The great prophet of an international tribunal to keep the peace of the world, who has so powerfully advocated the idea in recent years, sits on this platform, ready in his green old age for many years to come to speak words of inspiration to promote the cause so dear to his heart, and for whose success the world owes him more, in my judgment, than to any other living man.

The Conference of The Hague, for which the proposals of the Czar of Russia were received with ill-concealed contempt from many sources, has become the cornerstone of the future monument of peace. The last addition to this growing monument is the acceptance of this international tribunal by the assembled States of this hemisphere. Little would any man have dreamed a score of years ago that the States of South America would wheel into line and accept this great step onward of Christian civilization. The triumphant results of the Conference of delegates from this hemi-

sphere which has recently concluded its deliberations in the City of Mexico are a profoundly interesting achievement. The leader of the delegates from the United States was the Hon. William I. Buchanan, whom we have gathered to-night to hear speak on the results of the Conference.

Mr. Paine then introduced Mr. Buchanan, who, after expressing his gratification at the compliment paid him in having been invited to speak on the work of the Mexican Conference and his pleasure in having on the platform the distinguished and well-known American, Dr. Hale, spoke as follows:

Address of Hon. William I. Buchanan.

The Mexican Conference and Arbitration.

During the past few years our relations with the eighteen Republics south of us have become questions of interest and importance. This has been especially true since the Spanish-American War, growing out of which we have become through new responsibilities identified to a greater degree than before with Spanish-American language and thought. We have certainly been remiss in not having taken up years ago, as we are now doing, the endeavor to know the people and possibilities of these Republics better, and to have ourselves better known by them. We have certainly lost much by our negligence, both in commerce and in prestige among them. We begin to realize how far removed they are from us when we think that forty-five millions of their people speak the Spanish language, ten millions Portuguese, and two millions more French; and that in all the Republics of which I speak we have less than thirty-five thousand Americans; that we have no ships or banks there; and that in our own country not one person out of every three thousand can intelligently speak either of the two first languages I have named, while the number among us conversant with Spanish-American laws and judicial procedure can be counted probably within one hundred.

All this has made the two Pan-American Conferences that have been held national landmarks that will remain as points of beginning in the story of that better understanding between our people and those of our sister American Republics, that can only be woven in friendship, goodwill and confidence between each and all.

The first Conference, held twelve years ago, did not give the practical results many expected. It did much, however, in the interest of cordiality between the Republics represented, and left one good piece of work of a practical nature—the Bureau of American Republics. This Bureau was made an International Bureau in fact by the Mexican Conference, and given a wider scope within which to work.

The greatest good resulting from international conferences is that of acquaintance; a knowledge on the part of each delegation of the difficulties surrounding other delegations; the opportunity to measure and estimate men and to weigh the forces and resources behind them, and to gauge one's self and country. Undoubted good comes from such contact even though it be neither

tangible nor apparent at once, since each step, however insignificant it may be, taken by a people in the direction of their uplifting and betterment, is a victory that can never be lost, a mark fixed on the road towards their national advancement. The first and second Pan-American Conferences were convened in this spirit and with these aims. At each all the American Republics were represented, and at the next, which will be held probably in 1906, the new Republic of Cuba, now coming into her own after years of trial and sacrifice, will be added.

The possibility of bringing the nineteen countries of which I speak together, to discuss without bias, and to endeavor to agree upon, questions affecting their public policy and commercial well-being involved some difficulties that will be apparent to those conversant with the questions that have unfortunately arisen and continue unsettled between some, and with the wide difference that exists between the fiscal policy and the natural and manufactured productions and consumption of each country. This was noticed during the period devoted to arranging a program for the Conference, when the differences existing between Peru and Chile, growing out of the unfortunate war between the two countries and Bolivia in 1882-83, seemed likely to prevent the complete success of the Conference. The good judgment displayed and the desire on the part of each country to make the general success of the Conference certain overcame this point, however, and made the road to a happy outcome possible.

It might appear strange that arbitration had the prominent place which it held in the thought of all delegations, when one recognizes that in the relations between the countries represented there was little ground to expect this. Such was the fact, however; indeed, all other questions were subordinated to that. This was partially accounted for by the fear felt by many delegates that it would be impossible to openly discuss arbitration and avoid the Chilean-Peruvian dispute, and these felt that if that occurred bitterness would likely result which would prejudice any harmonious outcome. This view was touched upon by the Mexican Minister for Foreign Affairs, Señor Mariscal, in his address upon the assembling of the Conference, when he said:

"I am certain you will do your utmost to avoid a spirit of dissension, whether it springs from concrete questions or from traditions or instinct. The love of our own country and our absolute identification with it are undoubtedly obligatory virtues and among our most sacred duties. While such is the case, we should not be so blind as not to recognize the rights of others. The truth is that when we treat of matters of such transcendent importance we ought to forget that we belong to this or that section of the continent, so that in our actions there should appear neither South, Central, nor North Americans, but only Americans in the broadest meaning of that word."

Mr. Mariscal, who uttered these wise, pacific words, is one of the coming men of Latin America. He is one of the best informed and one of the purest minded of the public men of Latin America.

The organization of the Conference was similar to that of the first in 1889. The Mexican Minister for

Foreign Affairs and our Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, were made honorary presiding officers. The delegation representing the Mexican government, the host of the Conference, was given, as was our delegation at Washington, precedence in all matters pertaining to the organization and work of the body.

Nothing could exceed the hospitality and kindness extended delegates by the Mexican people, nor the provisions made for their comfort and for the meetings and work of the Conference. The proceedings were in Spanish, translators being present to translate orally into English or Spanish addresses and motions made by delegates understanding only one of the two languages. The minutes were daily printed in English and Spanish in parallel columns and placed upon the desk of each delegate.

The personnel of the Conference was in many ways remarkable. Of the two delegates from the Argentine Republic one was Minister of Public Instruction in his country for a number of years, and the other a prominent member of the national Congress.

The delegate from Uruguay is the son of the President of that country and its diplomatic representative at Washington.

The Chilean delegation was composed of the present Chilean diplomatic representative at Washington, her diplomatic representative at Mexico, her former diplomatic representative in Peru, and her ex-minister to England and France,—four of the strongest men that Chile has. This is a key, which all of you, I think, will readily appreciate, to the interest taken by Chile in what might be the outcome of the Conference.

The Peruvian government sent the Vice-President of their country, a distinguished jurist and justice of their supreme court, and their diplomatic representative at Washington.

The Brazilian government sent an ex-justice of their supreme court, one of their most eminent jurists and public men.

Colombia was represented by their commander-in-chief of the army and ex-minister to France.

Salvador was represented by her Minister of Foreign Affairs and one of her prominent senators.

Mexico was represented by nine of her most distinguished public men, while the other Republics were represented by their diplomatic representatives at Washington, or those accredited to one of the European courts.

All delegates had plenipotentiary powers, with the exception of those from the United States, Guatemala and Paraguay.

The work of the Conference was divided among committees, the largest committee being that on arbitration, which was made up of one representative from each delegation.

And now let me refer to some of the principal things done. The Washington Conference (1889-1890) passed a resolution providing for a commission to investigate the practicability of an international railway. This was done, and an extensive report printed recommending its construction. This was heartily endorsed anew by the Mexican Conference, and a committee of five was appointed to investigate and study the advantages and

assistance that could be secured toward its construction and completion from the different countries through which the line would run. I may say in passing that this international railway is a thing which some of the members of the United States delegation, notably Senator Davis, have taken very deeply to heart. Senator Davis has associated with him men of means and influence in this country, and there seems to be, from their standpoint, no reason to believe that within the next twenty years Buenos Ayres will not be connected by railway with Chicago.

Another subject discussed at length at the first Conference was the matter of a customs union and custom house regulations. Two radically different reports were then made; the majority strongly favored the negotiation of reciprocal treaties, while both favored the adoption of a common commercial nomenclature, and a uniform system of classification, examination and valuation of customs merchandise. The commercial nomenclature recommended was afterwards prepared and printed by the Bureau of American Republics in English, Spanish and Portuguese, but no practical use has ever been made of it by the different governments.

The difficulties which the different governments found with the recommendations of the Washington Conference as to reciprocal treaties were recognized by the Mexican Conference, where it was agreed, after a full interchange of views between delegates regarding what might best be done of a practicable character, to avoid recommendations of a specific nature on the subject of reciprocity, that subject being recognized as covering so wide a diversity of interests and public opinion as to make discussion thereon fruitless. A more practical course was taken. This was the signing of a resolution, unanimously approved by the Conference, providing for the meeting of a customs congress in New York during next year. This congress is to be composed of one or more delegates who are to be appointed by each American government from among its customs officers, consuls or members of chambers of commerce possessing technical knowledge with regard to customs matters. It is to discuss and recommend to the different governments represented its conclusions upon the following:

The simplification and making uniform of customs regulations for the entering, despatch and clearance of vessels, merchandise and baggage; the best method by which a common nomenclature in English, Spanish, Portuguese and French can be adopted by each government in its customs schedule and laws, and as the basis of statistics; the desirability of holding similar regular customs congresses; and, lastly, the organization of a permanent customs commission, that shall be charged with studying the customs regulations and tariff laws of each of the American Republics, in order to suggest to all measures to simplify and facilitate commerce between them.

From what I have said it will be seen that the work of the last Conference was in advance of that of the first on this question, and that great benefit may come from the customs congress to meet next year.

The Conference found that nothing practical had been obtained from the work of the first Conference on the subject of sanitation or quarantine. In considering this question the Conference met with the same obstacles

found by all who have given attention to international quarantine as carried out by the different American Republics. The wide difference between our own system, which gives each State quarantine supervision over its own coast line, and that of the South American Republics, where the subject is one handled by national laws alone, with the conflict of business interests always involved and the lack of similarity between the sanitary laws of the different Republics, made it clear that it would be wise to adopt the method applied in the case of the customs regulations question. As a result a resolution was unanimously adopted that will do more, if carried out, to improve the sanitary conditions of the Republics represented than has been done up to this time by any of the means that have been tried.

The resolution recommends, first, the adoption by each Republic of the principle that all measures relating to international quarantine shall be wholly within the control of the national governments; that there shall be established only two kinds of quarantine detention — the one, inspection and observation, the other, disinfection; that prohibitive quarantine on manufactures and merchandise be abolished; that each government shall coöperate and lend every possible aid towards maintaining modern sanitary conditions within all ports, to the end that quarantine restrictions may be reduced to a minimum and finally abolished; that health organizations shall promptly notify diplomatic or consular representatives of all serious pestilential outbreaks; and that sanitary authorities shall note on a vessel's bill of health, prior to its sailing, the transmissible diseases existing in such port at that time.

The resolutions also provide for the holding in Washington during next year of a general convention of representatives of the health organizations of the different American Republics. Each government is to be represented by one or more delegates who are to have the necessary authority conferred upon them to enable them to conclude such sanitary regulations as in the judgment of the convention may be in the best interests of all. Most important of all, the convention is required to designate a permanent board of not less than five members, to be known as the "International Sanitary Bureau," with permanent headquarters at Washington.

Second only to the clause creating this Bureau is the one by which each of the Republics agrees to transmit promptly and regularly to the Bureau all data relative to the sanitary conditions of their ports and to furnish every opportunity and aid for a thorough study and investigation of any outbreak of disease that may occur within their territory. This provision is an important one since it grants for the first time the right of investigating contagious diseases which may be in progress by an authorized official bureau.

For those of you who are not entirely familiar with the rather delicate relations that exist and have existed between some of the American Republics, it will be hard to realize the importance of this concession. There is and has been a great deal of sensitiveness existing when it comes to authorities of one Republic going into another Republic and making investigations in regard to disease and sanitation. Hence this concession, which was agreed to by all in the interests of humanity, is a thing of far-reaching importance, and indicates that

coming together of the Republics which is so much hoped for and sought for by all who have their interests at heart.

The method adopted when the subject of the free navigation of international rivers came before the Conference will show the advantage taken of the errors of the first Conference. At the first, this subject was discussed at length and two reports presented. The majority report recommended and declared that rivers separating different states or flowing through their territories should be open and free to navigation. It will be apparent to those familiar with the position taken by Brazil regarding the navigation of the Amazon, and with our own policy with regard to the St. Lawrence, that no such declaration could be made effective. This subject was met at the Mexican Conference by the signing of a convention between the delegations from the Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay agreeing to hold a Geographical Fluvial Conference in Rio during next year, if such conference meets the approval of the Brazilian government, that government, owing to the death of its delegate, not being represented at the time this convention was signed. This proposed conference is to consider the practicability of organizing geographical exploration commissions to study the interior rivers of South America and to make a report as to the practicability and the expenditure that would be required to bring about a connection between the headquarters of the three great waterways of South America, the Orinoco, the Amazon and the Rio de la Plata Rivers, by the use of tributary rivers and the construction of a short canal between the latter two. Many will no doubt remember that explorations that have been made in the heart of the South American Continent have indicated that it is apparently practicable to connect the three great rivers I have named and in this way to provide an interior means of ample water transportation to the Atlantic available for all the Republics of South America. If this fact can be demonstrated the Rio Conference, if held, will certainly accomplish a noted work.

Many of you will no doubt remember that during the past few years explorations of the great rivers of South America have been made, especially of the basins of the Amazon and the Orinoco, and that it is believed to be practicable to connect these rivers at their sources. It is also said that the distance between the source of the Rio de la Plata, or of its tributary the Paraguay, and that of the Amazon, is only about twenty-eight miles, and that with connection made over that short distance a boat could pass up the Amazon and down the Rio de la Plata to Buenos Ayres.

Among other subjects embodied in a proposed form of treaty by the Washington Conference was that of extradition. A form of extradition treaty was agreed upon at the last Conference, based upon the treaties enacted within the last few years between the United States and the Argentine Republic and Mexico. One clause was inserted that is new to all extradition treaties up to the present, and interesting in view of the discussion going on with regard to the punishment of anarchy. This clause provides that:

"The extradition of any individual guilty of acts of anarchism can be demanded whenever the legislation of the

demanding state and of that on which the demand is made has established penalties for such acts."

This clause, which may seem to you a very mild one, was inserted after a lengthy discussion and after innumerable stronger clauses had been rejected. These latter sought to oblige each country to punish anarchy; but the more the subject was discussed, the greater were the difficulties found in framing an article that would cover the case and be consistent with international law and the rights of the individual.

One convention agreed upon, of interest to our own people, provides between the different governments for the reciprocal recognition of diplomas issued for the practice of the learned professions by recognized universities and institutions of learning. In so far as the United States was concerned, it was difficult to formulate this convention in a manner satisfactory to the other Republics because of the fact that while the latter have national institutions of learning, we have none. To cover this the following was agreed to:

"The signatory countries shall only recognize the titles and diplomas issued by the colleges and universities of those of our states and territories whose legislation offers reciprocity."

Each country reserves the right to require physicians, pharmacists or dentists presenting diplomas to submit to a general examination; and each country is to submit to the others a list of its institutions of learning whose diplomas are accepted as valid. Through the Department of State we are to notify each of the Republics of legislative action by our different states providing for the recognition of diplomas of other Republics. The importance of this convention is apparent when we consider the number of young men graduating from our universities who would like to engage in the practice of some profession in one of the countries to the south of us, and the fact that the rule in almost all of these is that, before a diploma will be recognized, the holder must submit to an examination in Spanish or in Portuguese, if it is in Brazil, which requires a course of study in the national college of that country and of course the acquisition of its language, thus making it practically impossible for our graduates to secure a foothold. If this proposed convention is approved by our government, this condition will be done away with, and a graduate from one of our universities, say in Massachusetts, can take up the practice of his profession in any one of the signatory Republics, provided the State of Massachusetts advise the State Department that it will recognize diplomas issued by the institutions of learning of the said Republic. That does not seem to be a very serious matter for any one of our states to do, and it appears to me that it is an entirely proper piece of reciprocity.

Another resolution passed provides for the exploration and preservation of the historic ruins existing in the different Republics, and for the establishing and maintenance at each of a museum to contain the objects of interest found in that locality. This cannot but be gratifying to all who take an interest in the marvelous relics of pre-historic times existing in several of the Republics.

From the imperfect outline I have given of some of

the work done by the Conference, you will note the possibilities underlying it all and the advantage we should secure from the adoption of its recommendations by our government. Outside the creation of the Bureau of American Republics and the International Railway Commissions, I believe we have never as a government confirmed the recommendations of the first Conference, called, too, by us, as it was. Let us hope that in our interest and standing among the other Republics a different fate awaits the work of the last Conference.

I may say, in passing, that in contradistinction to the method adopted by the first Conference, which was that practically all of its findings were to be put in proposed treaties which would require the action of Congress, we were able at Mexico to pass several important matters in the form of simple resolutions which it is in the power of our government to carry out without going to Congress.

I have left a reference to the subject of arbitration, as it was dealt with by the Conference, until the last. The circumstances surrounding this subject were peculiar. Every delegation was ready to assent to a treaty recognizing the principle of arbitration; but several, indeed more than a majority, would not consent to stop with that. These wanted obligatory arbitration. They were divided among themselves, however, as to the extent to which the obligation to arbitrate should go.

Peru was in favor of a treaty without reservations of any kind, and desired that it should include "pending questions" as well. Her unsettled dispute with Chile, covering territory in possession of the latter, made her position defensible and clear. Mexico, on the other hand, desired certain reservations in the obligatory clause. These were those in which "independence" and "national honor" were involved. She desired, however, to define a list of subjects to be considered as *not* being included within the term "national honor." Venezuela desired a reservation covering questions involving her rivers, while other delegations were willing to consent to an obligatory clause if it excepted, without definition, questions affecting their "independence" and "national honor." As but few of the Republics had any "pending questions" unadjusted, nearly all were ready to agree to have that clause included.

This wide divergence of views as to the scope of the obligatory clause made it difficult for the majority to agree upon a form of treaty, since it was argued by some that the elasticity of the phrases "independence" and "national honor" was so great that they were equivalent to the word "voluntary." As the weeks went by this difference among the delegations favoring obligatory arbitration was marked by an apparent desire on the part of some to reach a conclusion, for the moral effect it might have, that would throw the Chilean delegation, which stood for voluntary arbitration or nothing, into a hopeless minority on a test vote; hence, a compromise was at one time reached that appeared likely to command a majority of the Conference, by just one vote, and lead to that result. That vote, however,—that of Mexico,—was withheld, because of the great desire especially manifested on the part of that government, and to a degree on the part of all other delegations as well, to find a solution that would be, first of all, acceptable to our government, and then, if possible, a unanimous one.

Our position with regard to the subject was looked upon as strange and vacillating, since at the first Conference we advocated and voted for obligatory arbitration, whereas Mexico and Chile did not. Since that time, however, we seem as a government and people to have agreed to the broad proposition that while obligatory arbitration would be a blessing to the world, if carried out, and while it is reasonable in theory, it is ineffectual, owing to the utter absence, outside the two countries interested, of any motive power to bring about its use. I believe this view is correct, because, no matter what the character of the obligatory phrase may be, there exists no power foreign to the countries that are parties to a dispute that can be called in, or that outside countries would permit to be called in, that would attempt to force a country to carry out such an obligation in a case wherein it might decide that its independence, its national life, or its interests would be jeopardized, or that it would be humiliated by a recourse to such arbitration. Indeed, this view is apparently becoming well established, and it will be found, I think, that but few of the seemingly large number of so-called obligatory arbitration treaties that have been signed between different countries during late years merit that classification, since they refer in a majority of cases to specific questions that are clearly understood by each, that have arisen or that may arise between the signatory countries.

The most complete type of general obligatory arbitration treaty of which I have any knowledge is the treaty signed about four years ago between Italy and the Argentine Republic during my residence in Buenos Ayres as United States Minister. This, however, has not yet been approved by the Argentine Congress. It was first submitted to the Argentine Senate, which amended it by excluding questions affecting the constitution of either of the two contracting countries. With that amendment it passed to the Argentine Chamber of Deputies, where it still awaits action. A later treaty of this character was signed between Peru and Bolivia, but the Bolivian Congress adjourned within the past three months without giving its sanction thereto.

It is certainly apparent to any one that the words "national honor" and "independence" are susceptible of such a wide construction as to easily permit either country to an arbitration treaty containing them as exceptions to decline to arbitrate any serious question that might lead to a rupture, because it is difficult to conceive of such a question or situation arising between nations in which the "national honor" would not occupy the chief place.

The view evidently taken by our government was that under the conditions existing at the Conference the highest good would be secured, and the greatest advance made toward arbitration in fact, by the adherence to the Hague Convention on the part of all the countries represented at the Conference; that while that Convention was sometimes referred to by those in favor of so-called obligatory arbitration as being meaningless and without force, no answer could be made to the statement that, notwithstanding such criticisms, it stood to-day as high-water mark in international arbitration and as the best stepping-stone in existence toward the diminution of war. More than this, that the adherence of the American Republics to the Hague Conventions and their par-

ticipation in that tribunal would so strengthen the latter and extend its influence, and, as well, add so much to the wide sentiment existing in favor of the pacific settlement of international questions, that it would be not only wise to endeavor to secure such a result, but that the best interests of the Republics themselves would be strengthened and conserved thereby.

This view at first met considerable opposition from those in favor of an obligatory form of convention, but as the weeks went by and the wisdom of harmonious action in the Conference on such an important subject became clearer, all sought, so far as they could within their instructions, to find a solution that would lead to something practicable in the end and that would be of value to the cause of peace throughout the world.

A common ground was finally found upon which all were in more or less full accord. This was, first, that the discussion of the general topic of arbitration should be avoided in the conference, and, second, that a direct vote between obligatory and voluntary arbitration should not be forced. The solution of the question of what plan of procedure might be adopted by which to carry out the wishes of all in these regards and still secure a definite result was a simple one, nevertheless it involved the application to the problem of considerable tact and discretion and the concurrence beforehand of all delegations, or at least of a strong majority. The course decided upon included the following: first, the signing between all delegations and delegates, excepting those from Chile and Ecuador, who declined to sign on the ground that it was an act done outside the Conference and in accordance with a prearranged plan to which they were not parties, of a protocol of adherence to the Hague conventions, with an additional clause requesting the president of Mexico to investigate the extent to which it would be possible to secure the adherence of all the American Republics to an arbitration convention in its scope in advance of that of The Hague; second, the signing between the ten delegations favoring obligatory arbitration of a project for such a treaty, in accordance with the provisions of the Hague Convention itself, the treaty to recognize the Hague Tribunal as arbiter; third, both documents to be transmitted to the Conference by a simple agreed-to-form of note signed by the delegates who had signed each document, requesting the Conference to transmit them to the Mexican Minister for Foreign Affairs, with the request of the signatory delegations that he should transmit each, properly certified, to the different governments whose delegates had signed them.

This was a plan which possibly those of you who followed the newspapers may have taken some interest in at the time, because it occupied some two weeks, as I now recall it, in order to bring it about. There was underlying it just a bit of history like that which somehow has to do with almost all international affairs, and that was the tacit understanding had by the Chilean government when they accepted the invitation to attend the Conference that obligatory arbitration regarding pending questions would not be brought into the Conference; if it was, the Chilean government stated that they could not send delegates, and if it should be brought up during the Conference, they should feel at liberty to withdraw their representatives. It was the

wish and purpose of some, at any rate, — there is no necessity for stating who, — to see that the Conference remained intact, and that neither Chile nor any of the other delegates should have an excuse for withdrawing. Hence it was deemed best to bring this agreement about outside the Conference rather than attempt it in the Conference, which would have brought up all the bitterness resulting from the Chilean-Peruvian trouble and would have resulted in nothing.

By this course two things were accomplished: first, a discussion of the subject-matter was made impossible, because the documents were transmitted to the Conference with a specific request on the part of signers that they be sent to the Mexican Foreign Office; they were thus not subject to regular order in the Conference; and, second, their insertion in the minutes of the Conference was thus secured. The plan was not carried through, however, except at the end of a parliamentary fight on a point of order which involved the entire arrangement thus agreed upon. This debate occupied three entire sessions. At the end of that time, however, the question was happily concluded and the original plan carried through by the concurrence of Chile and Ecuador, in a motion, to which the remaining seventeen delegations agreed, made to have the minutes of the three sessions to which I have referred considered and accepted as sufficient and ample evidence of the adherence of both these countries to the Hague protocol. With this secured in the open Conference, that document thus became the unanimous expression of the entire Conference. It was signed by every delegate in his official capacity, and was acquiesced in — possibly reluctantly, but very graciously — in the open Conference by the two delegates who had declined to sign it previously.

In thus bringing about, not only the acceptance of the Hague Convention on the part of all, making it as a result a World's Convention in the interests of mediation and peace, but, also, the signing of an obligatory convention between ten Republics by which they obligate themselves to arbitrate their questions and to refer them to the Hague tribunal, and, lastly, the conclusion of the additional protocol, signed by all, agreeing for five years to submit to the Hague tribunal pecuniary claims of citizens of one country against the government of another, when they cannot be adjusted through diplomatic channels, the Conference certainly reached a step far in advance of that heretofore taken by any international conference held, with the possible exception of that of The Hague.

It was the feeling of delegates at the close of the Conference that their work had not been in vain, and that these results alone would make the Mexican Conference a memorable international event, and one worthy the desire for confraternity between the peoples of the American Republics that inspired the late President McKinley, in his message to Congress, to suggest its calling.

I can do no better, in closing, than to read you the protocol of adherence to the Hague Conventions thus unanimously adopted by the Conference. Possibly none of you have seen it intact, with the preamble and the entire number of clauses which it contained. It is as follows:

"Whereas, The delegates to the International Conference of the American States, believing that public sentiment in the Republics represented by them is constantly growing in the direction of heartily favoring the widest application of the principles of arbitration; that the American Republics, controlled alike by the principles and responsibilities of popular government and bound together by increasing mutual interests, can, by their own actions, maintain the peace in the continent, and that permanent peace between them will be the forerunner and harbinger of their natural development and of the happiness and commercial greatness of their peoples;

"They have therefore agreed upon the following

"PROJECT.

"Article I. The American Republics represented at the International Conference of American States in Mexico, which have not subscribed to the three Conventions signed at The Hague on the 29th of July, 1899, hereby recognize as a part of public international American law the principles set forth therein.

"Art. II. With respect to the Conventions which are of an open character, the adherence thereto will be communicated to the government of Holland, through diplomatic channels, by the respective governments, upon the ratification thereof.

"Art. III. The wide general convenience being so clearly apparent that would be secured by confiding the solution of differences to be submitted to arbitration to the jurisdiction of a tribunal of so high a character as that of the Arbitration Court at The Hague, and also that the American nations not now signatory to the Convention creating that beneficent institution can become adherents thereto by virtue of an accepted and recognized right; and further, taking into consideration the offer of the governments of the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, the Conference hereby confers upon said governments the authority to negotiate with the other powers signatory to the Convention for the peaceful adjustment of international differences and for the adherence thereto of the American nations so requesting and not now signatory to the said Convention.

"Art. IV. In order that the widest and most unrestricted application of the principle of just arbitration may be satisfactorily and definitely brought about at the earliest possible day, and to the end that the most advanced and mutually advantageous form in which the said principle can be expressed in a convention to be signed between the American Republics may be fully ascertained, the President of Mexico is hereby most respectfully requested to ascertain by careful investigation the views of the different governments represented in the Conference regarding the most advanced form in which a general arbitration convention could be drawn that would meet with the approval and secure the final ratification of all of the countries in the Conference, and, after the conclusion of his inquiry, to prepare a plan for such a general convention as would apparently meet the wishes of all the Republics, and, if possible, arrange for a series of protocols to carry the plan into execution; or, if this should be found to be impracticable, then to present the correspondence with a report to the next Conference."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the arbitration work of the Conference at Mexico, a protocol of adherence to the Hague Conventions and their acceptance as principles of American international law; a request to the President of the Republic of Mexico to see if there was any step beyond that to which the American Republics

would go; and, in addition to that protocol, the signing of an agreement on the part of ten nations obligating themselves to go to that tribunal and settle their differences; and also an agreement in which nineteen nations joined to go to the same tribunal and adjust pecuniary claims—those miserable things which do so much at times to stir up ill-feeling between nations and which are the cause sometimes of open rupture.

These three things, in my judgment, should rank, and will rank, the Mexican Conference as the most remarkable conference held. For the first time—and I believe it is an omen of good fortune—for the first time the nineteen Republics of this hemisphere stood united, as you have seen, not only upon these principles, but upon questions of quarantine and sanitation and on other questions of national importance to every one of us.

Address of Dr. Edward Everett Hale.

The Present Position of the International Tribunal.

I am very grateful, indeed, to have an opportunity to speak for a few minutes. I want to express to Mr. Buchanan more than the thanks of this audience. I want to convey to him the thanks of America for the work which he and his fellow-delegates have done in Mexico [Applause]; a work which he must permit me to say is a monument to American skill and American diplomacy; a work which from day to day has shown the wisdom of well-trained Americans in the cause of international justice as no other work which I remember in the history of America, except the work of our delegates at The Hague.

Mr. Paine has intimated that this assembly likes to hear from time to time of the position of the great international tribunal of the world,—a tribunal which exists for something more than peace, even; it exists for "international justice." That is the better phrase. The movement which led to the great Hague Conference and to the three Hague Conventions is a movement for justice between nations. It prevents war—yes! It prevents also a great many other things. We do not call our Supreme Court a peace tribunal: we call it the Supreme Court of Justice; and that is what the court at The Hague is.

Now, that the nineteen States represented at Mexico (every State on this continent except the unfortunate Dominion of Canada),—that this Congress should have acceded to the work of the great Conference at The Hague is easily the largest and greatest tribute which in so short a time could have been rendered to the wisdom of the statesman who brought the Hague tribunal into being. And those persons who are profoundly interested in the work of the Hague tribunal accept this tribute of this half of the world. It is a more important verdict than anybody would have supposed could be rendered, that one hundred and twenty million people by their competent representatives should have pronounced their approval of the great measure with which the nineteenth century closed.

I am perfectly well aware—one cannot live in Massachusetts without being aware—that there has been